

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The office action mailed December 15, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully considered. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objections and rejections are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Several claims were objected to and the claims in general were objected to based on several minor informalities kindly identified by the examiner, as well as general mention of antecedent basis issues. In presenting the new claims, applicant has endeavored to review the claims carefully to ensure that proper antecedent basis guidelines have been followed. Should the examiner note any further issues, the examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned in order to expedite resolution.

Claims 1-26 were also rejected as allegedly being incomplete for omitting the structural relationship between the tail cover with respect to the housing body and the reflector. In formulating the new claims, applicant has endeavored to address this issue as well.

Claim 1 was rejected as being anticipated by Lyhne, and claim 14 was rejected as being unpatentable over Lyhne in view of Voorhees. Without conceding the propriety of the rejections, new claims 27-50 are presented, with independent claims essentially incorporating features that were noted allowable as discussed further below. Therefore, this rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to new claims 27-50.

The office action indicated that claims 2-13 and 15-26 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the indefiniteness in its rejections and to include the limitations of the their base claims. The examiner provided specific reasons for allowance with respect to claims 2, 3, 7 and 8.

In formulating new claims 27-50, four new independent claims are presented, that is claims 27, 28, 32 and 33. It is respectfully submitted that new claims 27, 28, 32 and 33 are allowable for substantially the same reasons as those given by the examiner with respect to now cancelled claims 2, 3, 7 and 8 respectively. Full consideration of these independent claims, as well as each of dependent claims, is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the allowance of this application is believed in order, and such action is earnestly solicited.

If, for any reason, the Examiner disagrees, please call the undersigned attorney at 202-861-1696 in an effort to resolve any matter still outstanding before issuing another action. The undersigned attorney is confident that any issue which might remain can readily be worked out by telephone.

In the event this paper is not timely filed, Applicant petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fee deficiencies or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2036.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP



Leo J. Jennings  
Reg. No. 32,902

Date: June 15, 2006  
Washington Square, Suite 1100  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036-5304  
Telephone: 202-861-1500  
Facsimile: 202-861-1783  
101336498.1